

tutes of Health and is designed to support research and development in education at every level and to carry on a small program of in-house research.

A prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sex in higher education programs or activities receiving federal funds is also part of the bill. Other new provisions include an authorization for grants to colleges and universities to develop ethnic studies curriculum materials and a title known as the Occupational Education Act, which is aimed at strengthening vocational education and giving it greater status at the post-secondary level.

Although neither the bill nor the conference report on the bill was available when this was written, it was possible through conversations with legislators and congressional staff members to establish the formula agreed on for the key institutional aid provision.

The higher education community seems to have convinced Congress that inflationary pressures, new demands on universities and colleges, and loss of federal research funds have put both private and public institutions in serious need of federal help. The education lobby, however, has so far failed to make a case for the program of direct grants to institutions, which it generally prefers. The result was a compromise on a complex three-way formula, with 90 percent of the funds going to institutions on the basis of federal aid received by their students. Half of this would be distributed to institutions in the form of cost of education allowances for financially needy students receiving federal basic education opportunity grants. If sufficient funds are appropriated, schools with up to 1000 students would get grants of \$500 per recipient, with the amount declining according to the size of enrollment, so that big schools would get only \$100 per recipient in excess of 100. Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), chairman of the Senate education subcommittee, is the originator of this approach. The other 45 percent of available funds would be distributed according to the aggregate amount of federal equal opportunity grants, work study funds, and federal loan funds received by each school's students. Again, there would be a bias in favor of small institutions. Representative Albert Quie (R-Minn.) is primarily identified with the measure.

The remaining 10 percent of available money would be paid on a per capita basis, according to the number of graduate students at an institution.

The amount mentioned in the bill would be \$200 per graduate student. Representative Edith Green (D-Ore.), who heads the House subcommittee which handles higher education legislation, sponsored the capitation formula and is displeased with the compromise on institutional aid and with other aspects of the conference measure. Mrs. Green has declined to sign the conference report and is expected to use her influence inside and outside Congress against the bill. She is likely to back an extension of existing legislation, most of which expires with the current fiscal year on 30 June, and to counsel

another attempt in the next Congress.

Most observers feel that the greatest difficulty in mustering a majority in favor of the present bill arises out of the busing provisions. Opposition comes, on the one hand, from those who would throw the full federal weight against busing and, on the other hand, from civil rights advocates who oppose any limits to busing. The bill now calls for delays—of up to 19 months or until appeals are exhausted—of court orders requiring busing to achieve school desegregation.

The Senate is thought likely to pass the bill more readily than the House,

Technology Assessment Hits Snags

The bill to establish an Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), which breezed through the House on 8 February, has become mired down in the Senate and faces an attempt by an obscure congressional committee to gain control of the proposed office. OTA would make long-range studies of issues such as the SST for Congress and would be funded at \$5 million for its first 2 years.

While George Wallace and Terry Sanford were battling out a Presidential primary in North Carolina last month, a Senate veteran, B. Everett Jordan (D-N.C.) who is chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration where the bill now resides, suffered an unexpected setback. Jordan lost in the popular vote by 4 percent to an energetic challenger, Nick Galifianakis (D-N.C.) and faces a runoff contest on 3 June. Jordan's presence is essential to get the bill out of committee and to the floor, and while he had been in favor of speedy action back in March, his new situation could, so to speak, make voter assessment take precedence over technology assessment.

A second jinx on the bill is a dispute which is materializing as to who will control the OTA, that is, on the makeup of its governing board. According to custom, those members of Congress who have been instrumental in originating and passing a measure can expect to have a role in overseeing the resulting office or agency. Hence, friends of the OTA in the House Committee of Science and Astronautics, and in the Senate, who have nourished the concept of OTA during its 7-year gestation in various committees, were expecting to sit on the board.

But others seem to be interested in this board, too. When the bill came to the House floor in February, a representative not hitherto identified with the measure, Jack Brooks (D-Tex.) proposed changing the board's makeup. Instead of a part-Congressional, part-public board, Brooks proposed one composed of five senators and five representatives; three of each would be Democrats and two of each would be Republicans. The House readily assented, and this is the current format for the OTA board.

However, it just so happens that Brooks is chairman of an obscure Joint Committee on Congressional Operations (JCCO), made up of five senators and five representatives; three of each are Democrats and two of each are Republicans. The JCCO has little power, almost zero visibility, and both Brooks and the alternate chairman from the Senate side, Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.), are up for reelection this year. Metcalf and Brooks are reportedly suggesting that the JCCO be metamorphosed into the Board of OTA. While the move would certainly enhance JCCO's stature, it would effectively exclude all the long-term proponents of technology assessment in both the House and Senate, none of whom sit on the committee. Should the suggestion come to a fight either in Jordan's committee or on the Senate floor later, the bill could be tabled this session.—D.S.